APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,532	01/16/2002	Victoria M.E. Bellotti	110143	7732

27074	7590	06/18/2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC.
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER
CHOUDHURY, AZIZUL Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	3

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO 90C (Rev 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _16 January 2002_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-24_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-24_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _16 January 2002_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative,

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Sakaguchi et al (US Pat No: US006594636B1),

hereafter referred to as Sakaguchi.

1. With regards to claims 1 and 10, Sakaguchi teaches a method for transmitting

   workflow-enabled electronic mail message from a user of a workflow system to a

   recipient, comprising: creating an email message to the recipient; determining a network

   address; embedding a link to the determined network address in the email message to the

   recipient; associating a process of the workflow system with the determined network

   address; and sending the email message having the link to the determined network

   address to the recipient (Sakaguchi teaches a email based workflow design. In the

   design, workflow definitions (definitions define the work to be flowed and include the

   claimed network address within them, hence workflow definitions are equivalent to the

   claimed network addresses) are chosen (determined) in one of a number of ways to best

suite the task at hand. In addition, since it is email based, the email must be created.

Since the workflow is sent as an email, the link as claimed must be embedded, this is

done in the form of workflow definitions within Sakaguchi's design (column 2, line 16 –

column 3, line 8, Sakaguchi)).

2. With regards to claims 2 and 11, Sakaguchi teaches the method wherein determining the

network address comprises selecting the network address from a list of predefined

network addresses (Sakaguchi's design uses workflow definitions (equivalent to the

claimed network addresses). These definitions are selectable from a list of predefined

definitions (column 2, lines 50-63, Sakaguchi)).

3. With regards to claims 3 and 12, Sakaguchi teaches the method wherein determining the

network address comprises generating the network address (Sakaguchi's design uses

workflow definitions (equivalent to the claimed network addresses). Sakaguchi's deign

allows these definitions to be generated as claimed (column 2, line 64 – column 3, line 3,

Sakaguchi)).

4. With regards to claims 4 and 13, Sakaguchi teaches the method wherein generating the

network address comprises randomly or psuedo-randomly generating the network address

(Sakaguchi's design uses workflow definitions (equivalent to the claimed network

addresses). Sakaguchi's design allows these definitions to be generated without being the

same as previous ones (hence pseudo-randomly (since nothing in computing is truly

randomly performed)) (column 2, line 64 – column 3, line 3, Sakaguchi)).

5. With regards to claims 5 and 14, Sakaguchi teaches the method wherein generating the

    network address comprises generating the network address based on at least in part on

    information about at least one of at least the created email message, the recipient, the

    workflow process and the user (Sakaguchi's design allows definitions to be derived from

    one or more definitions (column 2, lines 42-50, Sakaguchi)).

6. With regards to claims 6 and 15, Sakaguchi teaches the method further comprising

    associating the determined network address with the email message (The claimed step of

    associating the network address (workflow definition) with the email message is inherent

    in Sakaguchi's design).

7. With regards to claims 7 and 16, Sakaguchi teaches the method wherein associating the

    determined network address with the email message comprises associating an email

    address of the recipient to which the created email will be sent with the determined

    network address (The claimed step of associating the network address (workflow

    definition) with the email message and sending it with the email message is inherent in

    Sakaguchi's design).

8. With regards to claims 8, 17, 18 and 19, Sakaguchi teaches the method wherein:

determining a network address comprises determining a plurality of different network

addresses; and embedding a link to the determined network address into the email

message to the recipient comprises embedding a plurality of links into the email message,

each link being to one of the plurality of determined network addresses (As stated,

Sakaguchi's design uses workflow definitions which hold the network addresses. If

multiple network addresses are necessary in the workflow, these inherently must be

present within the workflow definitions).

9. With regards to claims 9 and 20, Sakaguchi teaches the method wherein associating a

process of the workflow system with the determined network address comprises

associating a different state of the associated process of the workflow system with each of

the plurality of determined network addresses (Each of the claimed network addresses are

known to be associated with different states of the workflow system. Each address links

to a specific state of the workflow and a plurality of addresses link to a plurality of states

of the workflow. Such features are inherent within email based workflow systems).

10. With regards to claim 21, Sakaguchi teaches a method for accessing a workflow process

using a workflow-enabled email message, comprising: receiving the workflow-enabled

email message that includes a link to a network address associated with the workflow

process, wherein the network address is specific to the workflow process and to the email

message; selecting the link to access the network address, wherein, in response, the

workflow system provides access to the workflow process (Sakaguchi's workflow system

is email based and hence the workflow definitions (network addresses) are sent by email.

Being such, the email messages must be received as claimed and the workflow

definitions (network addresses) must be used to access the state of the workflow process

in need of attention by the recipient. The claimed traits are inherent within email based

workflow systems).

11. With regards to claim 22, Sakaguchi teaches the method further comprising: receiving a

request to provide authentication from the workflow system in response to selecting the

link; and providing the requested authentication to the workflow system, the workflow

system denying access to the workflow process if the requested authentication is not valid

(The workflow is only sent to the selected user and each user address is unique in the

system ensuring authentication (since emails systems require sign-in procedures to access

emails) (column 4, line 53 – column 5, line 8, Sakaguchi)).

12. With regards to claim 23, Sakaguchi teaches a method for providing access to a workflow

process in response to receiving a network address that is associated with the workflow

process, comprising: receiving the network address from a user; determining if the user

from which the network address is received is a valid user of that network address; and

providing access to the user to the workflow process only if user from which the network

address is received is determined to be a valid user of that network address (Sakaguchi's

workflow system is email based and hence the workflow definitions (network addresses)

are sent by email. Being such, the email messages must be received as claimed and the

workflow definitions (network addresses) must be used to access the state of the

workflow process in need of attention by the recipient. The workflow is only sent to the

selected user and each user address is unique in the system ensuring authentication (since

emails systems require sign-in procedures to access emails) (column 4, line 53 – column

5, line 8, Sakaguchi)).

13. With regards to claim 24, Sakaguchi teaches the method wherein determining if the user

from which the network address is received is a valid user of that network address

comprises comparing an email address provided by the user to an email address

associated with the network address for the user (Means by which to check Ids are

present within Sakaguchi's design (column 4, line 53 – column 5, line 8, Sakaguchi)).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Azizul Choudhury whose telephone number is 703-305-7209.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AC

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100